What Ike Said on Shelters, P. 3

Judge Edgerton Writing to the Washington Post on Berlin Calls Ethics of the Duel Obsolete, Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, NO. 40 OCTOBER 30, 1961 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

U.S. and Moscow Reverse Roles on Testing at the UN

United Nations, N.Y., Oct. 24

On this, its 16th birthday, the United Nations is demonstrating how far short it falls of the world's needs and the moment's urgency. While the Russians continue with the most intense series of nuclear tests the world has ever seen, the UN is unable to pull itself together for action. Since Oct. 6, in its First Committee, on which all of its 101 members are represented, the UN has been unable even to get to a vote on two rival resolutions on nuclear testing, one by the Western Big Powers urging swift resumption of talks at Geneva, the other by India for a renewed suspension of all nuclear tests pending their permanent prohibition by treaty. In addition, since last Friday, Oct. 20, the Committee has been unable to come to a vote on an emergency resolution by the Northern countries most affected by Russian fallout asking Moscow to call off its 50 megaton test. Even the news of a 30-megaton test, twice as great as the 15-megaton U.S. test which was formerly the largest ever, failed to bring action, thanks to neutral weakness and big power obduracy, including a curious byplay in which the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. found themselves shoulder to shoulder, as it were, in blocking a vote on the 50-megaton protest. The petty considerations of individual nations, large and small, block the common planetary interest in saving the skies from pollution. The bankrupt jockeying demonstrates the need for a Parliament of Man, not of nations. Adlai Stevenson said despairingly in his speech to the First Committee last Thursday, "Just as the nuclear bomb itself lays open the inner mysteries of science, so the attempt to control the nuclear bomb cuts to the core of our political ideas and mechanisms. As the bomb itself represented a revolution in science, so the control of the bomb may in the end mean a revolution in politics."

The Big Powers Think Alike

This revolution—if it comes in time—will be more fundamental than Marx's. The debate has served to illuminate how alike the two great contending Powers are in their thinking. Their standards are the conventional ones of the anarchistic nation-state system. As Mr. Shaha of little Nepal said after Mr. Stevenson spoke, "the great powers think alike on situations involving so-called security considerations." Each consequently finds it easy to quote the other in its own defense since the underlying logic is the same even when the positions are reversed. The Western powers four years ago would not hear of a nuclear test ban apart from general disarmament while the Soviets were for separating the two. Now they have changed sides. As Mr. Krishna Menon said sardonically last Friday after two full weeks of inconclusive, largely procedural, debate, "I find that it is rather like ladies' fashions. If you wait long enough, the old fashions come back. The argument that is rejected by one side this year is accepted by the next, and it goes round and round in this way."

Thus as the debate here warmed up, Mr. Godber of the United Kingdom came up with a nifty from a speech by Mr. Zorin in the First Committee three years ago, Oct. 10, 1958. Then Mr. Zorin said, "The Soviet government considers that it is essential for the cause of peace to separate the question of the cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons from the general or comprehensive problem of disarmament, to solve it separately from all other disarmament questions." This brought a retaliatory quotation from the Soviet side. Mr. Tarabanov of Bulgaria said that during discussion of this same problem in 1957, the United Kingdom representative at the UN had said "a measure of that kind without any link to the problem of disarmament—that is to say, a measure contemplating the suspension of nuclear tests—could have a negative effect on world security, and would not necessarily facilitate the reaching of an agreement on general and complete disarmament."

The Bulgarian went on triumphantly to declare that the United Kingdom delegate in 1957 had used words which

(Continued on Page Two)

Not Quoting Pauling This Time

In 1957 when Czechoslovakia led the fight in the UN for cessation of nuclear testing, its delegate Mr. David in the First Committee quoted Dr. Linus Pauling, Nobel prize winning chemist, as estimating that "tests of nuclear and hydrogen weapons carried out thus far were responsible for a one percent increase in the total number of mentally retarded or deformed children." (Nov. 7, 1957). This year, when Czechoslovakia led the fight in the Special Political Committee at the UN against "alarmist" reports of the danger from fallout, Dr. Pauling was no longer quoted by any member of the Soviet bloc. In a telephone interview with Scripps-Howard reporter Gene Wortsman (Washington Daily News, Oct. 19), Dr. Pauling estimated that the Soviet Union's 50-megaton blast would cause 40,000 babies to be born with physical defects in the next few generations; pollute the atmosphere for 6,000 years with radioactive debris which would produce another 400,000 stillbirths; bring about "uncounted cases of bone cancer, leukemia and related diseases"; damage the eyes of persons within several hundred miles of the explosion; and bring serious illness to many within the area of the explosion. Only a few months ago the Senate Internal Security Committee was pillorying Dr. Pauling as a Communist mouthpiece for insisting (in his famous petition campaign) that radiation was bad for people. Now we suppose the other side will be denouncing him as an imperialist tool.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exactly sum up the Soviet position today—"in any case his Government was not prepared to take that risk as long as it was not certain that there would be real disarmament, and it must attempt to improve the nuclear weapons upon which the security of his country and of other countries rested." The Bulgarian asked, "What practical result could be reached with a separate discussion of the problem of nuclear tests?" In answer Sir Michael Wright came up with a clincher. Sir Michael reminded the Soviet side that when a *Pravda* correspondent asked Mr. Khrushchev in Oct. 1958 "what his views were about making a link with disarmament a condition for a nuclear test ban treaty, Chairman Khrushchev's reply was: 'Is there any surer way of sabotaging the suspension of nuclear tests than by such conditions?'" Never did the (capitalist and/or communist) devil more brilliantly demonstrate his proverbial capacity to cite (the other fellow's) Scripture to his purpose.

The Czechs Quote Ike

This use by each side of the arguments once put forward by the other reached a climax of comedy in the Special Political Committee. There the Czechs led the Soviet bloc in a week-long fight to have the Committee do no more than "note" the latest report from the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. The report itself was about as innocuous as anything which has come from this slow moving and ambivalently oracular body, on which the U.S. is represented by two scientists notoriously embalmed years ago in official oils, Dr. Shields Warren and Dr. Austin M. Brues, spokesmen for the Tellerite radiation-won't-hurt-you lobby. The Committee in its three page report daringly recognized "that the resumption of nuclear testing since the publication of its last comprehensive report increases the urgency for intensification of relevant scientific studies." A 25-nation resolution in which the Canadians were prime movers asked the Special Political Committee to express concern over the "sharp increases" in radioactivity, and to ask the radiation committee to speed up its comprehensive report and perhaps make an interim one. The 25-nation resolution also invited the World Meteorological Organization to extend its weather reporting network to the monitoring of radioactivity, in cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency. This was too radical for the Soviets.

The Russians had already objected at the IAEA in Vienna to any such reporting. In their eyes to measure fallout from Soviet tests is cold war propaganda. It is scientific only when capitalist fallout is to be monitored. The Czech delegate, Mr. Pudlak, accused the 25 nations of attempting to railroad through an "alarmist" resolution. Mr. Pudlak recalled that when in 1957 the Czech delegation took the initiative in the First Committee in insisting that the UN take up the ques-

A Denial from The New York Times

We have received two letters, one angry from Max Frankel, the other friendly from Clifton Daniel, his managing editor on the New York Times, about our page one box (Oct. 16) asking whether the German Ambassador was the source of Mr. Frankel's story in the Times Oct. 8 saying the Kennedy-Gromyko talks had gone badly and represented a step backward. Mr. Daniel's letter was to a reader of the Weekly, Mr. Frankel's was to us. Both denied that the German Ambassador was the source of Mr. Frankel's story. Mr. Frankel doesn't seem any longer to agree with his own scoop because in the New York Times (Oct. 22) he wrote that while the Soviet positicn "had not changed . . . in tone it was now moderate, cordial and at least tolerable." That is a different tune from the one he played two weeks earlier. Then his coincided with the German Ambassador's. Mr. Frankel accused us of poisoning the public mind by implying that his story came from Herr Grewe, who agreed with it so heartily that same day on TV. Mr. Frankel wrote that it came from more than one allied source. The only two allied sources in town which took that dim a view of the Kennedy-Gromyko talks were the Germans and the French. If the story didn't come from the German Ambassador it certainly came from somebody in his entourage. We still think the New York Times has no business with these use-it-but-don't-quote-me stories, and that its readers had to look pretty closely next day to learn that the White House had denied the Frankel story. It gave the German Ambassador a world-wide sounding board for his campaign to make the outlook for negotiation look as black as possible.

Famous Appeals Court Judge Calls Ethics of the Duel Obsolete in the Nuclear Age

"Because the rulers of Russia are brutal men, should the U.S. be ready to join with them in destroying both countries and much besides? The President said in his recent speech to the United Nations, "We shall be remembered either as the generation that turned this nation into a flaming pyre or the generation that met its vow 'to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.'

"Though 'vow' is figurative, 'flaming pyre' is the literal truth, at least as to great centers of population like New York, Chicago and Washington. Against a flaming pyre there is no defense. It follows that, at least as to great centers of population the campaign for shelters is only an anodyne that makes nuclear war more possible by making it seem less frightful.

"Yet in this same speech the President said: 'The Western powers have calmly resolved to defend, by whatever means are forced upon them, their obligations and their access to the free citizens of West Berlin and the self-determination of those citizens.' This means that these powers have resolved to apply in the present crisis a national morality inherited from the pre-nuclear age. . . .

"The question is not, should we turn 'this planet into a flaming pyre' rather than submit to control of the U.S. by the rulers of Russia. . . . The present question is, should we end the world rather than negotiate changes in the status of West Berlin and clarification of the relations of West Berlin and West Germany with East Germany. . . .

"It is thought that we should lose prestige if we engaged in give and take with Russia, and it seems to be assumed that this would be worse than nuclear war. The President has spoken of 'humiliation.' Such attitudes survive from times when not only weapons but ideas were more primitive than they are now. If a gentleman was humiliated, honor called for war. Mankind can no longer afford such attitudes. Even as long ago as 1915, when the Germans sank the Lusitania, President Wilson said we were 'too proud to fight.' A mature nation may well be too proud to turn this planet into a flaming pyre over Berlin. It might well be humiliated by any thought of entering a nuclear war to avoid humiliation."

—Judge Henry W. Edgerton, U.S. Court of Appeals, in a letter to the Washington Post, October 20.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of fallout from testing, "Mr. Wadsworth of the United States justified the American tests as a necessary step for the defense of the country, and he was prepared to talk about tests only as the concluding stage of one of the programs of disarmament." This so exactly expresses the Soviet position today that for a moment one suspected that Mr. Pudlak tongue-in-cheek was doing a Soldier Schweik on the Soviet bloc. Mr. Pudlak said the U.S. and the United Kingdom would be well advised not to support an "alarmist" resolution on fallout lest this prove embarrassing when *they* resume testing. "To avoid such compromising situations in the position of the United Nations, depending on who happens to be carrying out tests at a given moment," Mr. Pudlak argued, "I should recommend that the Committee adopt the Czechoslovak resolution which . . . does not voice an alarm." The Czechoslovak delegate even appealed to the example of an elder statesman whose views are not often treated with respect in the Soviet world. "I read recently," Mr. Pudlak said, "that former President Eisenhower, in reply to the question whether he wished to build an air raid shelter, said that he did not because otherwise his actions might cause alarm or panic in the whole neighborhood of his farm. Well, we, as an organ of the UN," Mr. Pudlak pressed home his point, "should *we* act less responsibly than President Eisenhower?"

Try This Guessing Game

To show readers how strikingly the powers have changed sides we offer a parlor game. Here are two more sample quotations and we ask them to guess when and by which side they were uttered. Here is one, "A separate approach to the problem of suspending tests of nuclear weapons was impractical because it did not go to the heart of the real problem confronting the world, namely, the danger of war and the use of weapons of any kind on a mass scale. Even if all the test explosions were stopped, the stockpiling of atomic and hydrogen weapons would continue . . . a more comprehensive approach was imperative." This might be Khrushchev talking now. Actually it is in the official summary of the speech made at the 12th Session of the UN by Henry Cabot Lodge. Here is another, "The question of the discontinuance of tests of nuclear weapons was the easiest to settle, and its solution would have the most far-reaching consequences. Apart from removing a serious threat to mankind, it would serve to clear the international atmosphere by promoting a restoration of mutual confidence; it would make it easier to resolve the other problems of disarmament, and it would put an end to the production of increasingly destructive nuclear

(Continued on Page Four)

We Use The Same Flatfoot Batista Did

Our hat is off this week to Tad Szulc of the New York Times for writing and his paper for printing a story (Oct. 22) exposing the fact that Col. Mariano Faget, an anti-Communist specialist in the Batista secret police, was being used by our immigration service to screen anti-Castro refugees. Mr. Szulc notes that Senor Faget's so-called Bureau of Repression was so ineffective that "the entire Communist apparatus" survived the Batista regime intact. Cuban refugees complain it hardly encourages democratic anti-Castro forces to find a Batista secret service man in so strategic a spot here. We heard in Washington as Mr. Szulc did before the Cuban invasion, that all anti-Batista elements had been weeded out. It turned out this was untrue and that the highest circles in our government seemed to have remarkably little control of its cloak-and-dagger operations. The news that this Batista man is still operating shows the need for a shakeup. A shakeup of this kind is exactly what will not come about if a man like McCone is confirmed by the Senate to succeed Dulles at CIA.

One story on Cuba we did not see in the New York Times last week was the AP dispatch from Buenos Aires (Washington Star, Oct. 18) saying that a committee of Argentine handwriting experts had "ruled false the only incriminating document among material handed over by Cuban exiles to support their charge that Fidel Castro has interfered in Argentine politics." We wonder why this was not considered fit to print.

Some Items on the Shelter Follies You May Not Have Seen In Your Local Paper

To keep readers abreast of the shelter follies, we note some significant items they may not have seen in their local papers. In Newark campaigning, former President Eisenhower told a press conference he wouldn't build a shelter on his farm because it might alarm the neighbors. The New York Post's gifted Murray Kempton, who was there, quoted Eisenhower (Oct. 18) as saying, "If I was in the finest shelter in the world all alone with all my family somewhere else, I just think I'd walk out. I wouldn't want to live in that kind of a world."

Adam Yarmolinsky, special assistant for civil defense to the Secretary of Defense, told a Women's National Democratic Club luncheon in Washington (Washington Post, Oct. 18) they had nothing to worry about because the Capital would be low down the list of potential targets in any reasonably planned enemy attack during the next few years unless "the Russians just got mad." Let's not get them angry and let's be sure the Russian General Staff reads Marshal, we mean Mr. Yarmolinsky's speech. As the latter projects it, the Russians only have enough bombs to hit at military targets if they're going to be sensible. "Casualties from blast and fire, as a result of an attack," Mr. Yarmolinsky observed, "even on military installations would run into the millions" but in and around cities many could be saved by shelters. That is, if our estimates of the Russian stockpile—and temper—are accurate.

News not quite as bright as that was dug up by John M. Goshko a Washington Post reporter (Oct. 22) assigned to find out what happened when the Army Corps of Engineers made spot checks in White Plains, N.Y., and an industrial corner of southeast Baltimore on space that might be used in existing structures for shelter. Their findings indicate there may not, after all, be space enough available for that 50 million—or one fourth of the population—we were assured so recently could be sheltered in existing buildings. Much of the space available turns out to be "in remote areas far removed from urban populations." There is also some question whether the national survey can be completed by the target date of December 1962. It is a good thing Khrushchev lifted his deadline on Berlin.

Peter Bart, who covers the advertising world for the New York Times, reported (Oct. 23) doubts about the lineage coming in from shelter manufacturers. As a result two leading magazines, the Saturday Review and the New Yorker, have declined to accept shelter ads at this time. Among doubts reported by Mr. Bart, "Would they really provide protection in an era of multi-megaton weapons? Was it a good idea to encourage private shelters. . . . What standards should be imposed on shelter manufacturers?" Some people just have no faith in free enterprise.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

U.S. "Filibuster" Helped Moscow Block 50-MT Protest Resolution

weapons." This might be Arthur Dean speaking now. Actually it was Gromyko at that same session in 1957.

The position taken by the Soviet Union in 1957 and by the U.S. now remains the right one. To defend its own testing the Soviet Union is taking positions not only arrogant but ludicrous. Mr. Green of Canada complained that the Soviet representative in Ottawa refused to accept a protest note from the Canadian government "on the ground that the proposed detonation of a 50-megaton bomb was a matter of internal concern only to the Soviet Union. Surely," Mr. Green observed incredulously, "it is not possible to contend seriously that filling the atmosphere with radioactive dust is a matter solely of domestic concern." But the unhappy Mr. Stevenson was in not too different a position when he had to tell the First Committee that we reserved the right, whatever world public opinion, to make atmospheric tests, too.

Even Buddha Had First to Give Up His Throne

On this issue a certain community of interest is visible between the two great Powers. Thus, on U.S. insistence, the original Canadian draft on the dangers of atomic radiation in the Special Political Committee was watered down to remove a demand for cessation of all testing. Last night in First Committee the U.S. helped block a vote on the Northern resolution against the 50-megaton Soviet test just when India had agreed to support an amended version. This meant Afro-Asian votes for the resolution in the wake of protests stirred by the 30-megaton Soviet test. At this juncture Mr. Dean delivered an hour long speech on the Geneva test talks which Mr. Mezincescu of Rumania ungratefully called "a filibuster pure and simple." Before Mr. Dean spoke, Scandinavian diplomats had spent an hour trying to persude him to postpone his speech so they could push for a quick vote on their emergency resolution. The U.S. feared the resolution might constitute a barrier to atmospheric tests of its own.

Mr. Dean quoted Mr. Khrushchev in defense of the American position. "Should any of the States, in the present-day conditions, resume tests of nuclear arms," Mr. Dean quoted from a statement by Mr. Khrushchev on Jan. 16, 1960, "it is not difficult to imagine the consequences. Other States which possess the same weapons would be forced to take the same road." To this explanation, the delegate from Ceylon, Mr. Malalasekara made a moving Buddhist rejoinder, "We are aware," he said, that the Indian resolution for a moratorium on all tests pending a treaty "may put the U.S. at some disadvantage, for we have heard it said that the Soviet Union is maneuvering for a position in which, with an appearance of sensitiveness to popular demand, it would forego the announced [50 MT] test, and thus be relieved of criticism against itself for the recent resumption of tests. . . . But we who had the privilege of listening to President Kennedy in the General Assembly heard his impassioned appeal for a peace race and saw how earnest was his desire to end world conflict. . . . He was, we know, also voicing the deepest sentiments of his people. We can be sure that neither the distinguished President nor the people of his great land would hesitate to undertake risks, to sacrifice many advantages, in the cause of world peace. . . . In this vale of tears every worth-while choice also involves some kind of renunciation." But even the Buddha had first to give up his Kingdom before he could live by such noble standards. The choice is between humanity and practical politics, and the nature of the nation-state system makes humanity the loser.

Women to Strike for Peace

Borrowing their cue from Aristophanes who has the Greek women in Lysistrata abjure the embraces of their husbands until they promise to make peace, a group of Washington, D.C., housewives has launched a women's "strike for peace" to be held November 1. They plan a meeting near the Washington Memorial and the presentation of petitions to Mrs. Kennedy at the White House and for Mrs. Khrushchev at the Soviet Embassy. Groups elsewhere are asked to send telegrams. Their slogan is "End The Arms Race—Not The Human Race." As a husband we are alarmed at this move toward the unionization of women but we hasten to approve. "We are unwilling," said Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, one of the chief local sparkplugs of what has hopes of becoming a grass roots movement, "to face annihilation, or grovelling in underground shelters. Women spend years of their lives bringing up children. . . . Now, in the nuclear age, all women have . . . an even clearer and more urgent duty, to work for peace in order that our children may have a future." Is Mrs. Smith of Maine listening?

If you send a stamped self-addressed LONG envelope we'll send a free sample copy of this issue to a friend.

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

10/30/61

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last Monday in August and the first in September and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED